

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **March 8, 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Haggar et al (USPub 2002/0091904, hereinafter “Haggar”) in view of Shaylor (USPub 2002/0108025, hereinafter “Shaylor”). Claims 4-7, 11-14, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haggar in view of Shaylor in view of Otis (USPub 2002/0099765, hereinafter “Otis”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended independent claim 15 to include specific hardware elements. These amendments find support in FIG. 2 and in paragraphs [0033]-[0034] of the instant application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by Haggar in view of Shaylor. Applicant respectfully points out that Haggar teaches **intermixing storage blocks** from different tasks on the heap (see Haggar, paragraphs [0006]-[0008]) and Shaylor teaches keeping the heap memory for a task **within memory allocated for the task** (see Shaylor, FIGs. 4-5 and paragraphs [0037] and [0039]).

In contrast, the present invention uses a common heap in which the heap memory allocated to each task is **separate from the heap memory** allocated to all other tasks (see FIGs. 3, 4A, and 4B, and paragraphs [0034]-[0039] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows a garbage collector to operate on

the heap memory for a given task without having to operate on the heap memory for other tasks.

There is nothing within Haggar or Shaylor, either separately or in concert, which suggests using a common heap in which the heap memory is allocated to each task is **separate from the heap memory** allocated to all other tasks.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention uses a common heap in which the heap memory allocated to each task is separate from the heap memory allocated to all other tasks. These amendments find support in FIGs. 3, 4A, and 4B, and in paragraphs [0034]-[0039] of the instant application. Dependent claims 2-4, 9-11, and 16-17 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47,615

Date: March 23, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665